

## ATTACHMENT 1

### EPA Review Guidelines for Parcel G Forms, Plots, and Data

#### Flag in Plots

- Box plots
  - Significantly different populations; look at variability of range for each radionuclides provided
  - Biased lower than the others, would expect biased to be similar to or higher than systematic.
- Q-Q plots - Slope break, sometimes flatter, sometimes steeper, which would be sign of different populations; slopes should be similar for various scan types of each radionuclide (not necessarily for K-40)

#### Flag in forms

- Multiple rounds of excavations
- Gamma scan or static not provided or range less than 2,000-3,000 counts per min; Scan and statics not consistent (one example showed a range of 2,900 to 9,400 which is normal)
- Off site and on-site lab results significant difference, e.g. > 2X
- Time Series – Time series show anomalies or missing time series, e.g. S024, Cs-137 was remediated but graphs not provided

Other – Open-ended: anything else that looks noteworthy

#### Enter into Review Spreadsheet:

- Sign of falsification? 1=yes, 0=no, plus add summary of why
- Failure to follow workplan? 1=yes, 0=no, plus add summary of why
- Level of concern/need for resampling
  - 2=high level of concern, e.g. yes signs of potential deliberate falsification found, > 2-3 red flags from above
  - 1= need further review, e.g. no sign of potential deliberate falsification, some uncertainty due to missing or unclear information, 1 red flag found
  - 0=low, e.g. nothing noteworthy observed
- Comments – Other – anything not already covered elsewhere
- Followup research questions? Do we need more info from Navy to make determinations?